



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/440,442	11/15/1999	ARI V. KRISH	M-8038US	2954

33031 7590 07/17/2003

CAMPBELL STEPHENSON ASCOLESE, LLP
4807 SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD.
BLDG. 4, SUITE 201
AUSTIN, TX 78759

EXAMINER

NAJJAR, SALEH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

DATE MAILED: 07/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/440,442

Applicant(s)

KRISH, ARI V.

Examiner

Saleh Najjar

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 April 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4. 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2157

1. This action is responsive to the response to restriction requirement filed on April 3, 2003. Applicant elected without traverse the prosecution of group II claims 5-30 and canceled group I claims 1-4. Claims 5-30 are pending. Claims 5-30 represent a method, apparatus and program product directed toward optimizing and processing pages in multiple languages.

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear what the uniform locator is identifying in claim 15. Appropriate correction is requested.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jeske, U.S. Patent No. 5,974,443.

Jeske teaches the invention as claimed including a combined Internet and data access system via a plurality of interconnected platforms (see abstract).

As to claim 1, Jeske teaches a method for processing requests from a computer network, said method comprising:

accessing a computer network from a computer system and receiving a request from a requesting computer attached to the computer network, the request including a data string (see col. 3, lines 1-5, Jeske discloses that a data request is received from client browser in the form of a URL);

determining a URL corresponding to the data string, retrieving web page data from a web page corresponding to the URL and returning a responsive web page to the requesting computer, the responsive web page including the web page data (see col. 3-4, Jeske teaches that a URL is generated and transmitted by the browser which is evaluated by the server to process a responsive web page).

As to claim 6, Jeske teaches method for processing requests from a computer network, said method comprising:

accessing a computer network from a computer system, receiving a request from a requesting computer attached to the computer network decoding a data string included in the request; and matching the request to a template file (see col. 3-4, Jeske teaches that a URL is generated and transmitted by the browser which is evaluated by the server to process a responsive web page using a template file).

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 7, 10, 12-15, and 17-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jeske, U.S. Patent No. 5,974,443.

Jeske teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a combined Internet and data access system via a plurality of interconnected platforms (see abstract).

As to claim 7, Jeske teaches the method of claim 6 further comprising:
invoking a application process in response to the matching (see col. 3-4, Jeske discloses that the appropriate application is chosen for the requesting browser based on the type of request).

Jeske does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation of a department process. However, Jeske teaches that the appropriate application is chosen based on the browser request, for example an application for processing a bank statement may be invoked or a application for processing call record may also be invoked (see col. 3-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Jeske by specifying department logic in place of the application process since the same functionality is achieved.

As to claim 10, Jeske teaches a method for processing requests from a computer network, said method comprising:

connecting a computer to the computer network; receiving a data stream from the computer network; identifying a template within the data stream; searching a registration table, the searching programmed to locate application logic corresponding to the template; writing a web page resulting from the template; sending the web page to the computer network (see col. 3-5, Jeske discloses that a browser request is received by a CGIG process on the server and using a virtual application process 107, an HTML template is defined and populated with data to form a responsive web page).

Jeske does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation of a department process. However, Jeske teaches that the appropriate application is chosen based on the browser request, for example an application for processing a bank statement may be invoked or a application for processing call record may also be invoked (see col. 3-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Jeske by specifying department logic in place of the application process since the same functionality is achieved.

As to claim 12, Jeske teaches the method of claim 10 further comprising: opening a socket, the socket connecting the computer to the computer network, wherein the receiving and the sending is through the socket and closing the socket (see col. 3, lines 30-45).

As to claim 13, Jeske teaches the method of claim 10 further comprising: creating a processing thread to process the data stream (see col. 6-8).

As to claim 14, Jeske teaches the method of claim 10 further comprising: decoding the data stream, the decoding including decrypting the data stream (see col. 3-7).

As claim 15 is best understood by the Examiner, Jeske teaches the method of claim 10 further comprising:

decoding a uniform resource locator, the uniform resource locator included in the data stream and identifying a in the computer network (see col. 3-7).

As to claim 17, Jeske teaches the method of claim 10 further comprising: processing a header contained within the data stream, the processing including: evaluating a security token included in the header, the security token created during a prior session by a user, to determine whether the session is valid, and creating a new security token, the new security token used to validate subsequent sessions by the user. (see col. 4-5, Jeske discloses that a session identifier is read by the processing application for client validation or authorization and that a session key is created and transmitted to each browser upon each log on request).

As to claim 18, Jeske teaches the method of claim 10 further comprising: invoking a application process, the application process programmed to respond to a request included in the data stream.

Jeske does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation of a department process. However, Jeske teaches that the appropriate application is chosen based on the browser request, for example an application for processing a bank statement may be invoked or a application for processing call record may also be invoked (see col. 3-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Jeske by specifying department logic in place of the application process since the same functionality is achieved.

As to claim 19, Jeske teaches the method of claim 10 further comprising: identifying a template within the data stream (see col. 3-5, Jeske discloses that a template file is identified and used to create a responsive web page).

As to claim 20, Jeske teaches the method of claim 19 further comprising: searching a registration table, the searching programmed to locate application logic corresponding to the template; and writing a web page resulting from the parsing of the template (see col. 3-7).

Jeske does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation of a department process. However, Jeske teaches that the appropriate application is chosen based on the browser request, for example an application for processing a bank statement may be invoked or a application for processing call record may also be invoked (see col. 3-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Jeske by specifying department logic in place of the application process since the same functionality is achieved.

As to claim 21, Jeske teaches the method of claim 19 further comprising: parsing the template into one or more operators, tags, and banners (see col. 3-7).

Claims 22-26 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 7, 10, 12-15, and 17-21 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

7. Claims 8-9, 11, 16, and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jeske, U.S. Patent No. 5,974,443 further in view of Greer et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,247,048.

Jeske teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a combined Internet and data access system via a plurality of interconnected platforms (see abstract).

As to claims 8-9, Jeske teaches the method of claim 7.

Jeske fails to teach the claimed limitation of determining a character set, the character set including the character set used by the requesting computer, storing a predefined character read by the requesting computer; sending the predefined character from the requesting computer to the computer system through the computer network; reading a table, the table including a plurality of character codes and corresponding language codes; matching the predefined character to one of the plurality of character codes, the matching determining one of the plurality of language codes. Jeske does teach that the client's operating system is determined from the initial request (see col. 4).

However, Greer teaches a method and apparatus for transcoding character sets between Internet hosts and client devices over data networks (see abstract). Greer teaches the limitation of determining a character set the; character set including the character set used by the requesting computer, storing a predefined character read by the requesting computer; sending the predefined character from the requesting computer to the computer system through the computer network; reading a table, the table including a plurality of character codes and corresponding language codes; matching the predefined character to one of the plurality of character codes, the matching determining one of the plurality of language codes (see col. 2-7, Greer discloses that a character set used by the client is determined by looking up a definition table using the character set code used by the client for look up and transcoding character sets accordingly).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Jeske in view of Greer so that character set transformation is affected. One would be motivated to do so to allow universally located clients access to the hosted data in the network.

Claims 11, 16, and 27-28 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 8-9 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

As to claims 29-30, Jeske fails to teach the limitation of converting and storing content in a uniform language code and reconverting from a uniform language code to a language code of the client.

However, "Official Notice" is taken that the concept and advantages of converting and storing data to a uniform language code and reconverting from a uniform language code to a language code used by the client is old and well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Jeske by including uniform language code transcoding capability to allow simple translation to the client's language. One would be motivated to do so to allow universal access of network data.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saleh Najjar whose telephone number is (703) 308-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:30 to 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Ario Etienne*, can be reached on (703) 308-7562. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-9052.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600. The fax number for the After-Final correspondence/amendment is (703) 746-7238. The fax number for official correspondence/amendment is (703) 746-7239. The fax number for Non-official draft correspondence/amendment is (703) 746-7240.



Saleh Najjar

Primary Examiner / Art Unit 2157